

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 WILLIAM CUTLIP,
8 Plaintiff,

9 v.
10

11 DEUTSCHE BANK NATIONAL TRUST
12 COMPANY FOR THE HARBORVIEW
13 MORTGAGE LOAN TRUST PASS-
14 THROUGH CERTIFICATES 2007-7, et al.,
15

16 Defendants.
17

18 Case No. [15-cv-01345-BLF](#)
19

20 **ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO
21 DISMISS FOR LACK OF SUBJECT-
22 MATTER JURISDICTION**

23 [Re: ECF 21]
24

25 On May 11, 2015, *pro se* plaintiff William Cutlip (“Plaintiff”) filed a First Amended
26 Complaint (“FAC”) asserting claims against two defendants: (1) Deutsche Bank National Trust
27 Company for the Harborview Mortgage Loan Trust Pass-Through Certificates 2007-7 (“Deutsche
28 Bank”); and (2) attorney Benjamin Petiprin (collectively with Deutsche Bank, “Defendants”). *See*
FAC, ECF 21. Plaintiff seeks to void an unlawful detainer judgment entered against him in state
court on the basis of Defendants’ alleged extrinsic fraud. *Id.* at 2, 48. Before the Court is
Deutsche Bank’s Motion to Dismiss.¹ Def.’s Mot., ECF 33. For the reasons stated herein,
Deutsche Bank’s motion is GRANTED, and this action is dismissed for lack of subject-matter
jurisdiction.

29 **I. BACKGROUND**

30 This lawsuit is one of a number of actions that Plaintiff has filed in connection with a
31 foreclosure sale of real property at 619 Union Avenue Campbell, California. FAC at 6. Plaintiff
32 asserts that he is “the only party to this litigation with a recorded or unrecorded interest effecting
33

34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
5510
5511
5512
5513
5514
5515
5516
5517
5518
5519
5520
5521
5522
5523
5524
5525
5526
5527
5528
5529
5530
5531
5532
5533
5534
5535
5536
5537
5538
5539
5540
5541
5542
5543
5544
5545
5546
5547
5548
5549
55410
55411
55412
55413
55414
55415
55416
55417
55418
55419
55420
55421
55422
55423
55424
55425
55426
55427
55428
55429
55430
55431
55432
55433
55434
55435
55436
55437
55438
55439
55440
55441
55442
55443
55444
55445
55446
55447
55448
55449
55450
55451
55452
55453
55454
55455
55456
55457
55458
55459
55460
55461
55462
55463
55464
55465
55466
55467
55468
55469
55470
55471
55472
55473
55474
55475
55476
55477
55478
55479
55480
55481
55482
55483
55484
55485
55486
55487
55488
55489
55490
55491
55492
55493
55494
55495
55496
55497
55498
55499
554100
554101
554102
554103
554104
554105
554106
554107
554108
554109
554110
554111
554112
554113
554114
554115
554116
554117
554118
554119
554120
554121
554122
554123
554124
554125
554126
554127
554128
554129
554130
554131
554132
554133
554134
554135
554136
554137
554138
554139
554140
554141
554142
554143
554144
554145
554146
554147
554148
554149
554150
554151
554152
554153
554154
554155
554156
554157
554158
554159
554160
554161
554162
554163
554164
554165
554166
554167
554168
554169
554170
554171
554172
554173
554174
554175
554176
554177
554178
554179
554180
554181
554182
554183
554184
554185
554186
554187
554188
554189
554190
554191
554192
554193
554194
554195
554196
554197
554198
554199
554200
554201
554202
554203
554204
554205
554206
554207
554208
554209
554210
554211
554212
554213
554214
554215
554216
554217
554218
554219
554220
554221
554222
554223
554224
554225
554226
554227
554228
554229
554230
554231
554232
554233
554234
554235
554236
554237
554238
554239
554240
554241
554242
554243
554244
554245
554246
554247
554248
554249
554250
554251
554252
554253
554254
554255
554256
554257
554258
554259
554260
554261
554262
554263
554264
554265
554266
554267
554268
554269
554270
554271
554272
554273
554274
554275
554276
554277
554278
554279
554280
554281
554282
554283
554284
554285
554286
554287
554288
554289
554290
554291
554292
554293
554294
554295
554296
554297
554298
554299
5542910
5542911
5542912
5542913
5542914
5542915
5542916
5542917
5542918
5542919
5542920
5542921
5542922
5542923
5542924
5542925
5542926
5542927
5542928
5542929
55429210
55429211
55429212
55429213
55429214
55429215
55429216
55429217
55429218
55429219
55429220
55429221
55429222
55429223
55429224
55429225
55429226
55429227
55429228
55429229
55429230
55429231
55429232
55429233
55429234
55429235
55429236
55429237
55429238
55429239
55429240
55429241
55429242
55429243
55429244
55429245
55429246
55429247
55429248
55429249
55429250
55429251
55429252
55429253
55429254
55429255
55429256
55429257
55429258
55429259
55429260
55429261
55429262
55429263
55429264
55429265
55429266
55429267
55429268
55429269
55429270
55429271
55429272
55429273
55429274
55429275
55429276
55429277
55429278
55429279
55429280
55429281
55429282
55429283
55429284
55429285
55429286
55429287
55429288
55429289
55429290
55429291
55429292
55429293
55429294
55429295
55429296
55429297
55429298
55429299
554292100
554292101
554292102
554292103
554292104
554292105
554292106
554292107
554292108
554292109
554292110
554292111
554292112
554292113
554292114
554292115
554292116
554292117
554292118
554292119
554292120
554292121
554292122
554292123
554292124
554292125
554292126
554292127
554292128
554292129
554292130
554292131
554292132
554292133
554292134
554292135
554292136
554292137
554292138
554292139
554292140
554292141
554292142
554292143
554292144
554292145
554292146
554292147
554292148
554292149
554292150
554292151
554292152
554292153
554292154
554292155
554292156
554292157
554292158
554292159
554292160
554292161
554292162
554292163
554292164
554292165
554292166
554292167
554292168
554292169
554292170
554292171
554292172
554292173
554292174
554292175
554292176
554292177
554292178
554292179
554292180
554292181
554292182
554292183
554292184
554292185
554292186
554292187
554292188
554292189
554292190
554292191
554292192
554292193
554292194
554292195
554292196
554292197
554292198
554292199
554292200
554292201
554292202
554292203
554292204
554292205
554292206
554292207
554292208
554292209
554292210
554292211
554292212
554292213
554292214
554292215
554292216
554292217
554292218
554292219
554292220
554292221
554292222
554292223
554292224
554292225
554292226
554292227
554292228
554292229
554292230
554292231
554292232
554292233
554292234
554292235
554292236
554292237
554292238
554292239
554292240
554292241
554292242
554292243
554292244
554292245
554292246
554292247
554292248
554292249
554292250
554292251
554292252
554292253
554292254
554292255
554292256
554292257
554292258
554292259
554292260
554292261
554292262
554292263
554292264
554292265
554292266
554292267
554292268
554292269
554292270
554292271
554292272
554292273
554292274
554292275
554292276
554292277
554292278
554292279
554292280
554292281
554292282
554292283
554292284
554292285
554292286
554292287
554292288
554292289
554292290
554292291
554292292
554292293
554292294
554292295
554292296
554292297
554292298
554292299
554292300
554292301
554292302
554292303
554292304
554292305
554292306
554292307
554292308
554292309
554292310
554292311
554292312
554292313
554292314
554292315
554292316
554292317
554292318
554292319
554292320
554292321
554292322
554292323
554292324
554292325
554292326
554292327
554292328
554292329
554292330
554292331
554292332
554292333
554292334
554292335
554292336
554292337
554292338
554292339
554292340
554292341
554292342
554292343
554292344
554292345
554292346
554292347
554292348
554292349
554292350
554292351
554292352
554292353
554292354
554292355
554292356
554292357
554292358
554292359
554292360
554292361
554292362
554292363
554292364
554292365
554292366
554292367
554292368
554292369
554292370
554292371
554292372
554292373
554292374
554292375
554292376
554292377
554292378
554292379
554292380
554292381
554292382
554292383
554292384
554292385
554292386
554292387
554292388
554292389
554292390
554292391
554292392
554292393
554292394
554292395
554292396
554292397
554292398
554292399
554292400
554292401
554292402
554292403
554292404
554292405
554292406
554292407
554292408
554292409
554292410
554292411
554292412
554292413
554292414
554292415
554292416
554292417
554292418
554292419
554292420
554292421
554292422
554292423
554292424
554292425
554292426
554292427
554292428
554292429
554292430
554292431
554292432
554292433
554292434
554292435
554292436
554292437
554292438
554292439
554292440
554292441
554292442
554292443
554292444
554292445
554292446
554292447
554292448
554292449
554292450
554292451
554292452
554292453
554292454
554292455
554292456
554292457
554292458
554292459
554292460
554292461
554292462
554292463
554292464
554292465
554292466
554292467
554292468
554292469
554292470
554292471
554292472
554292473
554292474
554292475
554292476
554292477
554292478
554292479
554292480
554292481
554292482
554292483
554292484
554292485
554292486
554292487
554292488
554292489
554292490
5542

1 [sic] title to the subject property.” *Id.* at 5. To perfect his interest, Plaintiff filed a quiet title action
2 on January 25, 2012 in state court against Downey Savings and Loan Association and U.S. Bank
3 N.A. Plaintiff later dismissed Downey and U.S. Bank and amended his complaint to add
4 defendant Deutsche Bank and Western Progressive LLC as defendants. *Id.* at 7; *see also* Def.’s
5 Request for Judicial Notice (“RJN”), ECF 34, Exh. 5 (October 9, 2014 Opinion of the California
6 Court of Appeal for the Sixth Appellate District) at 2.² The state court sustained with prejudice
7 the defendants’ demurrer to all of Plaintiff’s claims. FAC at 7; Def.’s RJN Exh. 4. That order was
8 affirmed on appeal. Def.’s RJN Exh. 5.

9 In the meantime, it appears that Plaintiff defaulted upon his mortgage on the Campbell
10 house. Western Progressive LLC, who claimed to be the successor trustee at the time, recorded a
11 notice of trustee’s sale and duly sold the house to Deutsche Bank in a foreclosure sale conducted
12 July 6, 2012. A trustee’s deed upon sale was recorded on July 20, 2012. Def.’s RJN Exh. 3 (June
13 24, 2014 Opinion of Appellate Division for the Santa Clara Superior Court) at 3. Plaintiff alleges
14 that this deed is “false evidence,” purportedly because Deutsche Bank represented itself in the
15 deed as “foreclosing beneficiary grantor” although it has “never been a grantee of the Cutlip’s
16 Deed of trust or promissory Note.” FAC at 20.

17 On August 14, 2012, Deutsche Bank initiated an unlawful detainer action against Plaintiff.
18 *Id.* at 7. Deutsche Bank submitted with its complaint a copy of the recorded trustee’s deed upon
19 sale as evidence of its right to possess the property. *Id.* at 22-23. In addition to alleging that the
20 deed itself was “false evidence,” Plaintiff also asserts that Deutsche Bank and defendant Petiprin,
21 who represented Deutsche Bank in the unlawful detainer action, “intentionally removed” a
22 disclaimer inscribed on the recorded deed that states “No representation as to its effect upon title.”
23 *Id.* at 6, 21, 22. Plaintiff alleges that by removing the disclaimer, Deutsche Bank falsely
24 represented to the unlawful detainer court that it had perfected its title to the Campbell property

25 _____
26 ² Deutsche Bank’s Request for Judicial Notice, ECF 34, is GRANTED because it seeks notice of
27 recorded instruments and court filings that are public records from sources whose accuracy cannot
28 reasonably be questioned. Fed. R. Evid. 201(b); *Reyn’s Pasta Bella, LLC v. Visa USA, Inc.*, 442
F.3d 741, 746 n.6 (9th Cir. 2006). The Court here DENIES Plaintiff’s August 18, 2015 and
August 21, 2015 Requests for Judicial Notice, ECF 50, 53, both because they are untimely and
because they contain only argument and do not attach any judicially noticeable documents.

1 even though (in Plaintiff's view) the disclaimer stated otherwise. *Id.*

2 Following a full trial on the merits, the unlawful detainer court, over Plaintiff's fervent
3 opposition, granted judgment in Deutsche Bank's favor, and that judgment was affirmed by the
4 appellate division on June 24, 2014. *See* Def.'s RJD Exhs. 2, 3. Plaintiff did not discover the
5 allegedly fraudulent removal of the disclaimer on Deutsche Bank's deed until after the conclusion
6 of the unlawful detainer proceedings. He now advances an "independent action in equity" to set
7 aside the unlawful detainer court's judgment on the basis of Defendants' alleged fraud on that
8 court. *See* FAC at 47.

9 **II. SUBJECT-MATTER JURISDICTION UNDER 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1332**

10 As an initial matter, and as is its obligation, the Court has reviewed the FAC and has
11 determined that Plaintiff's allegations are insufficient to support either the existence of a federal
12 question or diversity of citizenship. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(h)(3); *Snell v. Cleveland, Inc.*, 316
13 F.3d 822, 826 (9th Cir. 2002). "Federal courts are courts of limited jurisdiction." *Kokkonen v.*
14 *Guardian Life Ins. Co. of Am.*, 511 U.S. 375, 377 (1994). A claim is presumed to lie outside of a
15 federal court's limited jurisdiction unless the party asserting jurisdiction proves otherwise.
16 *Kokkonen*, 511 U.S. 375, 377; *Thompson v. McCombe*, 99 F.3d 352, 353 (9th Cir. 1996).

17 Federal jurisdiction generally arises in one of two ways: (1) from the presence of a federal
18 question, or (2) from complete diversity of the parties, where the amount in controversy exceeds
19 \$75,000. *See* 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1332. Federal question jurisdiction is determined from the face
20 of a well-pleaded complaint that "establishes either that federal law creates the cause of action or
21 that the plaintiff's right to relief necessarily depends on resolution of a substantial question of
22 federal law in that federal law is a necessary element of one of the well-pleaded claims."
23 *Christianson v. Colt Indus. Operating Corp.*, 486 U.S. 800, 808 (1988) (quoting *Franchise Tax
Bd. of Cal. v. Constr. Laborers Vacation Trust for S. California*, 463 U.S. 1, 13, 27-28 (1983)).
24 Federal question jurisdiction is only invoked when a "plaintiff's statement of his own cause of
25 action shows that it is based upon federal law." *Vaden v. Discover Bank*, 556 U.S. 49, 60 (2009).

26
27 There are no federal causes of action on the face of the FAC. Plaintiff identifies three
28 federal statutes, none of which confer subject-matter jurisdiction on this Court. First, Plaintiff

1 seeks equitable relief from this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1655, which states:

2 In an action in a district court to enforce any lien upon or claim to,
3 or to remove any incumbrance or lien or cloud upon the title to, real
4 or personal property within the district, where any defendant cannot
5 be served within the State, or does not voluntarily appear, the court
6 may order the absent defendant to appear or plead by a day certain.

7 28 U.S.C. § 1655 is a personal jurisdiction provision; it “confers *in rem* jurisdiction on the federal
8 courts only in cases that would be within federal jurisdiction if brought as *in personam* suits.” *GP*
9 *Credit Co., LLC v. Orlando Residence, Ltd.*, 349 F.3d 976, 979 (7th Cir. 2003); *see also Dluhos v.*
10 *Floating & Abandoned Vessel, Known as “New York,”* 162 F.3d 63, 72 (2d Cir. 1998); *Georgia*
11 *Central Credit Union v. Martin G.M.C. Trucks, Inc.*, 622 F.2d 137 (5th Cir. 1980) (per curiam).

12 In other words, Plaintiff must establish that the Court has subject-matter jurisdiction over this
13 dispute before he can invoke § 1655 to have the Court exercise jurisdiction over defendants with
14 an interest in the subject property.³ Second, Plaintiff invokes 42 U.S.C. § 1983. FAC at 9-10. As
15 the Court previously admonished, private parties such as Deutsche Bank cannot be held liable
16 under § 1983 and Plaintiff has sued no state actors here. *See Order Denying Ex Parte Appl. for*
17 *TRO* at 4-5, ECF 13. Section 1983 is therefore not available as a basis for this Court’s
18 jurisdiction. Finally, Plaintiff identifies the “Deceptive and Unfair Trade Practices Act,” which he
19 abbreviates as “FDUTPA.” *See* FAC at 9-10, 44-45. To the extent Plaintiff is referring to 15
20 U.S.C. § 45(a), the federal statute that prohibits “[u]nfair methods of competition in or affecting
21 commerce, and unfair or deceptive acts or practices in or affecting commerce,” that act may only
22 be enforced by the Federal Trade Commission. There is no private right of action under 15 U.S.C.
23 § 45 and Plaintiff therefore cannot rely upon that statute to invoke this Court’s jurisdiction.

24 As to jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a), “a party seeking to invoke diversity
25 jurisdiction should be able to allege *affirmatively* the actual citizenship of the relevant parties” on
26 the face of the complaint in order to confirm that all parties are diverse. *Kanter v. Warner-*

27

28 ³ Moreover, by virtue of the fact that Plaintiff himself filed a quiet title action in connection with
the subject property in state court, this Court may not exercise *in rem* jurisdiction over the
Campbell property under 28 U.S.C. § 1655 without impinging on the state court’s prior
jurisdiction over that property. *See Penn Gen. Cas. Co. v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania ex rel.*
Schnader, 294 U.S. 189, 198 (1935).

1 *Lambert Co.*, 265 F.3d 853, 857 (9th Cir. 2001) (emphasis added). Plaintiff is unquestionably a
2 citizen of California. FAC at 5. Plaintiff alleges that Deutsche Bank is a citizen of New York. *Id.*
3 Defendant Petiprin's state of citizenship is not alleged, but Plaintiff provides the address of his law
4 office, which is located in Huntington Beach, CA. *Id.* at 6. There are no factual allegations to
5 indicate that Petiprin does not reside in the state where he practices law. As such, the allegations
6 in the FAC reflect a lack of complete diversity between Plaintiff and Defendants. *See Owen*
7 *Equip. & Erection Co. v. Kroger*, 437 U.S. 365, 373 (1978) ("diversity jurisdiction does not exist
8 unless *each* defendant is a citizen of a different State from *each* plaintiff" (emphasis in original)).
9 Furthermore, Plaintiff has failed to demonstrate that the amount in controversy in this case
10 exceeds \$75,000. 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a). "In actions seeking declaratory or injunctive relief, it is
11 well established that the amount in controversy is measured by the value of the object of the
12 litigation." *Hunt v. Wash. State Apple Adver. Comm'n*, 432 U.S. 333, 347 (1977). The object in
13 litigation here is an unlawful detainer judgment that Plaintiff seeks to set aside. In unlawful
14 detainer actions, title to the subject property is not the object of the litigation, only the right to
15 possess the property. *Evans v. Superior Court*, 67 Cal. App. 3d 162, 170 (1977). As such, it is the
16 rare unlawful detainer action that can satisfy the jurisdictional amount to invoke this Court's
17 subject-matter jurisdiction and Plaintiff has failed to allege or demonstrate that his claim for
18 declaratory relief meets that jurisdictional limit.

19 This Court therefore lacks subject-matter jurisdiction over Plaintiff's claims under either
20 federal question jurisdiction, 28 U.S.C. § 1331, or diversity jurisdiction, *id.* § 1332(a).

21 **III. APPLICATION OF THE ROOKER-FELDMAN DOCTRINE**

22 Turning to the arguments advanced in the parties' briefing, the Court agrees with Deutsche
23 Bank that even if this Court had subject-matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 or 1332, the
24 *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine deprives this Court of jurisdiction to hear Plaintiff's claims.⁴ *See* Def.'s
25

26 ⁴ Plaintiff's "Demand" for a jury determination on Deutsche Bank's Rule 12(b)(1) motion to
27 dismiss for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction is DENIED. See ECF 49. Whether Plaintiff's
28 claims constitute a forbidden de facto appeal barred by *Rooker-Feldman* has nothing to do with
the merits of those claims and, as such, does not require the determination of disputed facts by a
St. Clair v. City of Chico, 880 F.2d 199, 202 (9th Cir. 1989).

1 Mot. 6-7. The *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine, named for *Rooker v. Fidelity Trust Co.*, 263 U.S. 413
2 (1923) and *District of Columbia Court of Appeals v. Feldman*, 460 U.S. 462 (1983), “recognizes
3 that 28 U.S.C. § 1331 is a grant of original jurisdiction, and does not authorize district courts to
4 exercise appellate jurisdiction over state-court judgments, which Congress has reserved to [the
5 Supreme Court].” *Verizon Maryland, Inc. v. Pub. Serv. Comm'n of Maryland*, 535 U.S. 635, 644
6 n.3 (2002) (citing 28 U.S.C. § 1257(a)). The doctrine applies to “cases brought by state-court
7 losers complaining of injuries caused by state-court judgments rendered before the district court
8 proceedings commenced and inviting district court review and rejection of those judgments.”
9 *Exxon Mobil Corp. v. Saudi Basic Indus. Corp.*, 544 U.S. 280, 284 (2005).

10 To determine whether an action functions as a forbidden de facto appeal of a state court
11 judgment, courts “pay close attention to the *relief* sought by the federal-court plaintiff.” *Cooper v.*
12 *Ramos*, 704 F.3d 772, 777-78 (9th Cir. 2012) (quoting *Bianchi v. Rylaarsdam*, 334 F.3d 895, 900
13 (9th Cir. 2003)). Here, the relief that Plaintiff seeks is an order “directing Honorable Judge Mary
14 J. Greenwood to vacate the trial courts Final order of December 28, 2012 112CV230319 and order
15 canceling Deutsche [Bank’s] Notice of default, purported trustee deed and substitution of trustee
16 and dismiss their case with prejudice.” FAC at 48. Although the Supreme Court has been very
17 sparing in its invocation of the doctrine, this case is clearly the quintessential case barred by
18 *Rooker-Feldman* because Plaintiff lost Deutsche Bank’s unlawful detainer action against him in
19 state court and has now repaired to federal court to undo the state court unlawful detainer
20 judgment against him. *Cf. Exxon*, 544 U.S. at 293.

21 Plaintiff does not dispute that he is seeking to vacate the state court’s judgment. He
22 asserts, however, that his claims survive under the “extrinsic fraud” principle set forth in
23 *Kougasian v. TMSL, Inc.*, 359 F.3d 1136, 1140-41 (9th Cir. 2004). *See* Pl.’s Opp. 3-5, ECF 45.⁵
24 The *Kougasian* exception is inapplicable. “Extrinsic fraud is conduct which prevents a party from

25
26 ⁵ Plaintiff filed two oppositions to Deutsche Bank’s motion. *See* ECF 45, 46. The first opposition
27 at ECF 45 is 32 pages in length, which is far in excess of this district’s page limits on motion
briefing. *See* Civ. L.R. 7-3. The second opposition at ECF 46 is shorter. The Court hereby
28 STRIKES Plaintiff’s second opposition at ECF 46 and STRIKES pages 27-32 of Plaintiff’s first
opposition at ECF 45. The stricken pages will not be considered.

1 presenting his claim in court.” *Kougasian*, 459 F.3d at 1140 (quoting *Wood v. McEwen*, 644 F.2d
2 797, 801 (9th Cir. 1981)). In *Kougasian*, the court found that a plaintiff could pursue a claim to
3 set aside a state court judgment procured by fraud where she alleged that the defendants prevailed
4 by filing a false declaration, that the court had based its judgment on the declaration, and that
5 “defendants prevented her from challenging the declaration by presenting it to the court at the last
6 minute and by refusing to provide the declarant’s telephone number or address.” *Id.* at 1138,
7 1140. The plaintiff was thus effectively barred from challenging the veracity of the declaration on
8 which the court relied.

9 Here, as a preliminary matter, it is not clear that Defendants tampered with the recorded
10 trustee deed, as opposed to simply providing the state court with an unclear copy. The copy of the
11 trustee deed that Deutsche Bank asks this Court to judicially notice appears to have the vestiges of
12 a stamp on its first page. *See* Def.’s RJD Exh. 1.⁶ This refutes Plaintiff’s allegation that
13 Defendants intentionally removed the stamp in the version presented to the unlawful detainer
14 court. FAC at 21. Moreover, even assuming as true Plaintiff’s allegation that the
15 “accommodation” stamp was not visible on the version submitted to the unlawful detainer court,
16 his theory of the case appears to rest on the flawed premise that the “accommodation” stamp on
17 the trustee’s deed is “used by title companies when the title company cant [sic] insure the title to
18 the property” and that the “title company cant [sic] insure the property and wont [sic] record the
19 document as a title instrument because the document will be susceptible to fraud and the title
20 company is liable.” Pl.’s Opp. 9-11. In other words, Plaintiff appears to believe that the
21 “accommodation” stamp is evidence that Deutsche Bank does not have title to the property, as
22 determined by the title insurance company that recorded the deed. *See id.* at 11 (“the stamp would
23 have prevented [D]eutsche from claiming a duly perfected title”). The practice of
24 “accommodation recording” is not entirely unheard of in California. As explained by one
25

26 ⁶ The Court takes notice that in a recent bankruptcy case in which Plaintiff’s wife filed an
27 adversary complaint on the same grounds as are asserted in the FAC, the Bankruptcy Court
28 likewise noted that “it appears that the stamp is indeed present, albeit faintly (likely due to artifacts
introduced by repeated photocopying), on Deutsche Bank’s version of the Trustee’s Deed.” Def.’s
RJD Exh. 9 at 4.

1 California Court of Appeal, a stamp stating the deed is being recorded as an accommodation with
2 no representations as to title simply disclaims a title company's liability for the correctness or
3 validity of the recorded document and is something "which essentially anyone can perform"
4 because "any member of the public may simply choose to record the document personally." *Rooz*
5 *v. Kimmel*, 55 Cal. App. 4th 573, 590 (1997); *see also In re Marriage of Young*, No. A114989,
6 2007 WL 2143007, at *6 (Cal. Ct. App. July 27, 2007) (citing *Rooz*, 55 Cal. App. 4th 573)
7 (reasoning that "[a]n 'accommodation recording' does not necessarily signify, however, the
8 absence of an intent to change beneficial ownership" and concluding that the "accommodation"
9 language on a grant deed did not alter its conclusion that the deed represented a change in
10 ownership).⁷ The stamp thus has no bearing on the actual determination of title or, more
11 importantly, the right to possession.

12 More fundamentally, Plaintiff's allegations fail to demonstrate that Defendants' alleged
13 misconduct constituted fraud extrinsic or collateral to the proceedings that prevented him from
14 presenting his claim. *See Green v. Ancora-Citronelle Corp.*, 577 F.2d 1380, 1384 (9th Cir. 1978);
15 *Kougasian*, 359 F.3d at 1140. Plaintiff had ample opportunity—and indeed availed himself of
16 every opportunity—to challenge Deutsche Bank's title to the Campbell property in both the
17 unlawful detainer and quiet title actions. In both cases, the courts reviewed all of Plaintiff's
18 documents and, after struggling with his arguments as much as this Court has, concluded that his
19 arguments did not merit success. *See* Def.'s RJN Exhs. 2-5. Indeed, the unlawful detainer court
20 examined all of the documents and authorities that Plaintiff presented to challenge Deutsche
21 Bank's right to foreclose and to obtain title over the property and rejected them all. *Id.* Exh. 2. To
22 grant Plaintiff's request to vacate the state court's judgment, this Court would have to conclude
23 that the state court erred in all of its conclusions. This Court has no jurisdiction to act in such an
24 appellate capacity over a state court. *Rooker*, 263 U.S. at 416.

25 In summary, Deutsche Bank's title was central to both the state court unlawful detainer and
26 quiet title actions and Plaintiff's allegations fail to demonstrate fraud extrinsic to those

27
28 ⁷ Although this opinion is unpublished and therefore not binding precedent under the California
Rules of Court, this Court finds its reasoning and application of *Rooz* persuasive.

1 proceedings that prevented him from challenging Deutsche Bank’s title and right to possess the
2 property. Courts routinely reject such attempts to overturn state court unlawful detainer
3 judgments based upon similar assertions of purported “extrinsic” fraud. *See Menna v.*
4 *Radmanesh*, No. CV 14-355-R MAN, 2014 WL 6892724, at *10 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 7, 2014) *report*
5 and *recommendation adopted*, No. CV 14-00355-R MAN, 2014 WL 6606504 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 5,
6 2014); *Obeng-Amponsah v. Naiman*, No. CV-14-635 GHK PJW, 2014 WL 4303764, at *3 (C.D.
7 Cal. July 30, 2014) *report and recommendation adopted*, No. CV 14-635-GHK PJW, 2014 WL
8 4309466 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 29, 2014); *Collazo v. Fed. Nat. Mortgage Ass’n Corp.*, No. CV 13-
9 00975 MMM JPRX, 2013 WL 2317798, at *5 (C.D. Cal. May 28, 2013).

10 When a case is a forbidden *de facto* appeal, a federal court must also refuse to hear claims
11 that are “inextricably intertwined” with the issues resolved by the state court to the extent hearing
12 such claims would “in essence” require the district court to review the state court’s decision.
13 *Feldman*, 460 U.S. at 483; *see also Noel v. Hall*, 341 F.3d 1148, 1157 (9th Cir. 2003). Issues are
14 inextricably intertwined where ““the relief requested in the federal action would effectively reverse
15 the state court decision or void its ruling.”” *Fontana Empire Ctr., LLC v. City of Fontana*, 307
16 F.3d 987, 992 (9th Cir. 2002) (quoting *Charchenko v. City of Stillwater*, 47 F.3d 981, 983 (8th
17 Cir.1995)); *see also Cooper*, 704 F.3d at 778-79. Here, Plaintiff asserts as unconstitutional both
18 California’s unlawful detainer law and the tender rule that the quiet title court invoked in ruling
19 against Plaintiff in that case. FAC at 45; Def.’s RJD Exh. 5 at 5-6. Insofar as Plaintiff is
20 advancing these claims of unconstitutionality against Deutsche Bank—a private party that merely
21 invoked the law—it is clear those claims are inextricably intertwined with his forbidden *de facto*
22 appeal of the state court’s judgment applying the challenged laws.⁸ In essence, Plaintiff is once
23 more contending that the state court erred in entering judgment against him pursuant to a
24 purportedly unconstitutional law or rule. Moreover, the relief that Plaintiff requests is precisely
25 what this Court cannot grant: review and rejection of the state court’s judgment. As such, this
26

27
28 ⁸ Moreover, it is not clear that Plaintiff can even assert a claim for relief against the defendants in
this case based upon the purported unconstitutionality of California’s unlawful detainer law and
tender rule. That is more likely an issue for a different case against different defendants.

1 Court also lacks jurisdiction to hear Plaintiff's constitutional claims under the *Rooker-Feldman*
2 doctrine. *Accord Menna*, 2014 WL 6892724, at *10-11; *see also Ritter v. Ross*, 992 F.2d 750,
3 754-55 (7th Cir. 1993).

4 **IV. LEAVE TO AMEND**

5 In dismissing Plaintiff's FAC, the Court is cognizant that "a document filed pro se is 'to be
6 liberally construed,' and 'a pro se complaint, however inartfully pleaded, must be held to less
7 stringent standards than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers.'" *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89,
8 94 (2007) (quoting *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97, 106 (1976)). "Unless it is absolutely clear that
9 no amendment can cure the defect . . . a pro se litigant is entitled to notice of the complaint's
10 deficiencies and an opportunity to amend prior to dismissal of the action." *Lucas v. Dep't of
11 Corr.*, 66 F.3d 245, 248 (9th Cir. 1995) (quoted with approval in *Merritt v. Countrywide Fin.
12 Corp.*, 759 F.3d 1023, 1041 (9th Cir. 2014)).

13 Here, the Court notified Plaintiff of deficiencies in his original complaint in denying
14 Plaintiff's Ex Parte Application for Temporary Restraining Order on March 27, 2015. *See* ECF
15 13. Plaintiff chose to amend by filing the FAC and adding defendant Petiprin to his suit. Having
16 reviewed the FAC and the judicially noticeable documents, further amendment of the pleadings is
17 unlikely to bring greater clarity. Nor is further amendment likely to surmount the significant
18 jurisdictional barriers to Plaintiff's claims. As such, Deutsche Bank's Motion to Dismiss is
19 GRANTED without further leave to amend.

20 **V. ORDER**

21 For the foregoing reasons, Deutsche Bank's Motion to Dismiss is GRANTED and this
22 action is DISMISSED without prejudice for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction.

23 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

24 Dated: August 28, 2015


25 BETH LABSON FREEMAN
26 United States District Judge
27
28